



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Conjectanea Talmudica: Notes on Rev. 13:18; Matt. 23:35f.; 28:1; 2 Cor. 2:14-16; Jubilees 34:4, 7; 7:4.—By
GEORGE F. MOORE, Professor in Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass.

1. "The Number of the Beast," Rev. 13:18. Caligula and Nero.

*Ωδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν· ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου, ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν· καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ χξς' (v. l. χις').

Most scholars rightly understand the author in these words to apprise his readers that the number 666 (or 616) conceals the name of a man, which is to be found by reckoning the numerical value of its letters in the method of "gematria" (γραμματεία). The objection that, if this had been his meaning, he should have written ἀνθρώπου τινός has no force in this barbarous translation Greek: ἀριθμὸς ἀνθρώπου is the literal equivalent of a Semitic מְנִינָא דְּבַר נִשָּׂא or מספר בן אדם. The alternative interpretation, 'human (i. e. ordinary) number,' is meaningless; cabbalistic operations on numbers are often most extraordinary, but they are always performed on 'ordinary' numbers.

The reading of almost all the manuscripts, 666, has long since been correctly reckoned out by 'those who have understanding' as נֶרֶוֹן קֶסֶר, Nērōn Kēsar (50+200+6+50, 100+60+200=666). The spelling קֶסֶר (not קִיסֶר) is abundantly attested in inscriptions and is undoubtedly the older orthography.¹

¹ Other decipherments, from Irenaeus on, belong only to the history—or the curiosities—of exegesis. To the latter class must be assigned Gunkel's mythological interpretation. That ingenious scholar discovers in 666, תְּהוֹם קַדְמוֹנִיָּה (sic), "Primaeval Chaos," our old acquaintance, the Babylonian Chaos-monster. According to him קַדְמוֹנִי is in Jewish writings "the standing attribute of those figures of primaeval times which themselves reappear in the last times, or at least have antitypes then" (*Schöpfung und Chaos*, 377). This sweeping assertion is illustrated by two examples, אָדָם הַקַּדְמוֹנִי the 'primal man' (Adam), and נָחִשׁ הַקַּדְמוֹנִי 'the primal serpent' (the tempter of Gen. 3). These happen, by a curious coincidence, to be the only examples of this "standing attribute" which are given in Levy's *Wörterbuch*. As to

There is, however, another reading, 616, represented by codd. C and 11, and attested by Tichonius and Irenaeus. The latter discusses the variant at some length, and it may be inferred from his emphatic repudiation of it that it had more currency in his time than would appear from our manuscript evidence. He surmises that it originated in an error of transcription; but this is not very probable. Many modern interpreters consider 616 as another "gematria" on the name of Nero, written נרו קסר; there is, however, no evidence that the name was ever written in this way, and a very strong presumption to the contrary. Nor has it escaped notice that the distinctive feature of the vision in Rev. 13, viz., that an image of the beast is made which men are constrained on pain of death to worship, points to Caligula rather than Nero. Following a suggestion of Zahn, therefore, Spitta, Otto Holtzmann, Erbes, and others explain the reading 616 as equivalent to Γάιος Καίσαρ (cf. 888 = Ἰησοῦς, *Sibyll.* i. 327 ff., a passage which Irenaeus seems to have in mind). If this view be correct, an older Jewish apocalypse from the last

the former, אדם הקדמוני is common in the Kabbala, but in the older literature the regular expression is אדם הראשון; in fact, the example cited by Levy from *Bemidbar Rabbah*, c. 10 (compiled about the 12th century), is the only instance of אדם הקדמוני I have noted. The phrase אדם הראשון, moreover, has no eschatological implications; it serves merely to distinguish 'the first Man' from man in general (אדם). The second expression, נחש הקדמוני, occurs more frequently, e. g. *Beresith Rabbah*, c. 22, cf. הנחש הראשון *Debarim Rabbah*, c. 5; but with no reference to a reappearance of the "old serpent" in the last times. So far, then, from being a "standing attribute" of any kind, קדמוני is an infrequent synonym of ראשון, and is of no mysterious significance.

In Trevelyan's life of Macaulay there is an amusing story about an Englishman in India who tried to prove to Macaulay that Napoleon was the Beast, because, he said, if Napoleon's name be written in Arabic with the omission of only two letters, it gives 666. Professor Gunkel's 666 is obtained by a similar procedure: by omitting the article—for which תהום רבה is no warrant—and giving to קדמוני a feminine ending which is not used in adjectives of this type (as if from יהודי one should make יהודיָה instead of יהודית) he gets the necessary sum and, incidentally, a grammatical monstrosity as well as a mythical monster.

years of Caligula has been altered by Christian hands in the reign of Domitian, and adapted to c. 17; one part of this adaptation being the change of 616 (Caligula) to 666 (Nero). An obvious difficulty of the hypothesis in this form is that it assumes the original numerical cipher, 616, to be calculated on the Greek name, while the substitute, 666, is based on the Hebrew. So far as I know, it has not been observed that the Hebrew name of Caligula, גסקלגס קסר (Gaskalgas) has the same value, 616 ($3+60+100+30+3+60$, $100+60+200$). The spelling is fortunately free from the uncertainties that beset names containing ך and ך' ; קלגס (pl. קלגסים) is the Latin *caliga*, of which Caligula is the diminutive (Tac. *Ann.* i. 41); גס, instead of the more usual גויס, גיים, Γάϊος, is probably a malicious witticism (גס, 'big, arrogant, braggart,' cf. the Syriac popular etymology ܟܠܓܝܬܐ, as if *καλή*+gula).¹

2. Matthew 23:35 f. The Blood of Zacharias.

"Ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἀβελ τοῦ δικαίου ἕως τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχίου, ὃν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου. Cf. Luke 11:51.

It is recognized on all hands that the words "the son of Barachias" (in Matthew; not in Luke) are an error arising from a confusion with the canonical prophet Zechariah, the son of Berechiah,

¹ גסקלגס, *Tos. Sotah* 13, 6; *Jer. Sotah* 9, 13; *Bab. Sotah* 33^a; *Seder Olam Rabbah* 30, cf. *Yalkut*, Daniel § 1061; *Seder Olam Zutta*, ed. Neubauer, p. 71; *Megillath Taanith*, 11; *Shir ha-Shirim R.* on 8:9. The variants גסגלגס, גסקלקס, are secondary.

The passages in *Sotah*, etc., bring Caligula into connection with Simon the Just, who hears an oracular voice (*bath kōl*) announcing that גסקלגס has been killed and his decrees annulled. The surmise might be hazarded that this anachronism originated in a confusion with Simon Kantheras, son of Boethos, whom Agrippa I appointed High Priest shortly after the death of Caligula (probably in 41 A.D.; see Fl. Jos., *Antt.* xix, § 297). In *Seder Olam Rabbah*, however, גסקלגס figures as the last of the eight kings of Javan, following two Antiochi, as though he were identified with Epiphanes; see also *Seder Olam Zutta* l. c. The resemblance between Caligula's purpose to set up his image in the Temple and the desecration of the Temple by Antiochus IV may be responsible for this confusion.

the son of Iddo (Zech. 1 : 1);¹ the name of Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah (Is. 8 : 2, LXX. Ζαχαρίας υἱὸς Βαβαχίου) may have been a contributory cause.² Most scholars are further of the opinion that the reference is to the murder of the priest Zechariah the son of Jehoiada, who was stoned in the court of the temple by order of King Joash (2 Chron. 24 : 19 ff.).³ Others think that the

¹ A similar confusion exists in *Targ. Lament.* 2 : 20 (on the words, "Shall the priest and the prophet be slain in the sanctuary of the Lord") : "As ye slew Zechariah the son of Iddo, the High Priest and faithful prophet, in the sanctuary of the Lord on the Day of Atonement, because he reproved you, that ye should not do evil before the Lord." The last words plainly refer to 2 Chron. 24 : 20 ; cf. *Targ. Chron. loc.* The prophet Zechariah is called "the son of Iddo" in Ezra 5 : 1 ; 6 : 14 ; cf. Neh. 12 : 4, 16. In *Gittin* 57^b נביא הוה בן דהוה is not another variation of the name but a scribal error ; the correct reading is found in *Ekah Rabbah* 2 : 5, נביא הוה בן דהוה וגו' ; cf. ib. Proem. 23 נביא הוה דהוה מוכח לו.

² Cf. *Pesikta*, ed. Buber, f. 122a : "They murdered Uriah the priest ; they murdered Zechariah." There is nothing in Jer. 26 : 20-23 to suggest that the Uriah whose murder is there narrated was a priest ; "Uriah the priest" comes from Is. 8 : 2. That Uriah the prophet (Jer. 26) was of priestly stock, though with a blemish in his pedigree, is affirmed also by Samuel b. Nahmani, *Pesikta*, 115b.

³ The Greek patristic interpreters, in whose Bibles the victim of Joash's resentment was called 'Αζαρίας, were uncertain whether the Zacharias of Matthew and Luke was the post-exilic prophet of that name or the father of John the Baptist (Luke 1 : 5 ff.). Of the father of John there were Christian legends, doubtless invented after the identification, that he was put to death by Herod because he would not surrender the child John, whom Herod imagined to be the future Messiah (*Protevangel. Jacobi*, 23) ; or that he was killed by the Jews because, as High Priest, he allowed Mary, after the birth of Jesus, to stand in the place in the temple assigned to the virgins (Origen on Matt. 23 : 35, Migne XIII. 1630 f. ; Theophylact *in loc.*, Migne CXXIII. 405 ; Euthymius Zigabenus *in loc.*, Migne CXXIX. 600). Jerome records the opinion of some that the Zechariah of our text was the father of John the Baptist : ex quibusdam apocryphorum somniis approbantes, quod propterea occisus est, quia Salvatoris praedicavit adventum. He decides in favor of the Zechariah of Chronicles, and notes that the Gospel in use among the sect of the Nazarenes actually read "Zechariah the son of Jehoiada," instead of "son of Berechiah" as in the canonical Matthew. In the Lives of the Prophets which go under the name of Epiphanius some recensions fuse all three Zechariahs in a composite figure. (See the texts in Petavius' ed. of Epiphanius ; Tischendorf's *Anecdota Sacra et Profana*, 1855 (both reprinted in Migne, XLIII.) ; I. H. Hall, *Journal of*

author of the Gospel had in mind the murder of Zechariah the son of Bareis (other MSS. Baruch, Bariskaios; see Niese), who was killed by the Zealots in the year 67 or 68 A.D. (Josephus, *B. J.* iv. 5, 4).¹ This view has recently found an earnest advocate in Wellhausen (*Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*², 370 n.; *Das Evangelium Matthæi*, 119 ff.). Wellhausen urges that Zechariah son of Jehoiada is very likely a figure invented by the Chronicler for a particular purpose, and, even if historical, an altogether obscure man, with whose story it could not be assumed that Jesus' hearers were familiar; Jesus himself may have known little about him, or, for that matter, about the Book of Chronicles at all. He was not killed "between the temple and the altar," but without, in the court of the temple. Finally, the decisive fact is that the Jews had killed many prophets and righteous men after his time, for example, in the reigns of Manasseh and Jehoiakim; his blood could not, therefore, be set over against that of Abel, the victim of the first murder, as the last blood of a righteous man shed in the land.²

Unquestionably the murder of Zechariah by the Zealots, on the very eve of the catastrophe of Jerusalem in which, according to the author of the Gospel, that generation expiated in

Biblical Literature for June, 1886, p. 29 ff.. Dec. 1886, p. 97 ff., June 1887, p. 28 ff.; Nestle, *Marginalien and Materialien*, 1893; *Syrische Grammatik*², Chrestomathia, etc.) Another legend about Zechariah's tomb is quoted by Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test.*, I. 1142 ff.

¹ Grotius suggested that, beside the historical reference to Zechariah the son of Jehoiada, Jesus prophetically pointed to the fate of this Zechariah the son of Baruch. Calmet (1722), who inclines to the opinion that Jesus refers to the latter, cites as predecessors in this identification "many learned commentators," as Grotius, Hammond, L. de Dieu, Constant. l'Empereur, Jansen. Among later authors, I find the same view attributed to J. A. Osiander (1744), Hug, Credner, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Gfrörer, Baur, Keim (see Fritzche and Meyer on Matt., and Winer).

² The explanation with which some commentators still satisfy themselves, viz. that the murder of Zechariah son of Jehoiada is narrated in the last book of the Old Testament, assumes that the author of the Gospel had a Hebrew Bible made up like a Leipzig stereotyped edition. So long as the books of the Hagiographa were copied in separate rolls, their order was a theory of no practical consequence. In this case the theory itself is not constant, Chronicles being sometimes the first, sometimes the last book in the list.

blood its own sins and those of its forefathers, is a very appropriate counterpart to that of Abel. Zechariah was, according to Josephus, an eminent and upright citizen whose hatred of wrong-doing and spirit of independence provoked the wrath of the Zealots, while his wealth aroused their cupidity; he was put to death "in the midst of the Temple," with circumstances of atrocity which were too much even for their Idumaeen associates; and, to judge from the prominence the historian gives to the episode, the crime made a deep and lasting impression. The name of Zechariah's father as we find it in the manuscripts (*Βάρεϊς*, *Βαροῦχος*, *Βαρισκαῖος*) may be explained as a corruption of *Βαραχίας*. The anachronism would be far from solitary in these chapters of the Gospel, and is not a sufficient reason for rejecting the identification.

Notwithstanding all this, however, it seems highly probable that the words of Matt. 23:35 refer to Zechariah the son of Jehoiada. Whether or not he was in reality an obscure or a wholly imaginary figure, it is certain that his death and its bloody expiation were the subject of a legend whose popularity is attested by the frequency with which it is repeated in Jewish sources; in this literature it is, in fact, the typical murder of a prophet.

Lightfoot, in his *Horae Hebraicae* on the passage, quoted *Jer. Taanith* 69^{a-b}, *Bab. Sanhedrin* 96^b, and gave a Latin translation of the story in which these two sources are—without further indication—combined.¹ The older form of the legend, in *Jer. Taanith* iv. 5 (ed. Zhitomir f. 21^b-22^a) is as follows:

R. Johannan said: Eighty thousand of the flower of the priesthood were slain on account of the blood of Zechariah.—R. Judan asked R. Aha, Where did they kill Zechariah? In the Court of the Women or in the Court of Israel? He answered, Neither in the Court of the Women nor in the Court of Israel, but in the Court of the Priests; and they did not treat his blood like the blood of a deer or an antelope. Of these it is written, "He shall pour out its blood and cover it with earth" (Lev. 17:13), but of this, "For the blood that she shed abode in the midst of her, on the bare rock she put it, [she did not pour it

¹ A similar contamination is found in several places in later Midrashim.

out upon the ground nor cover earth over it" (Ezek. 24:7)]. Why? "To rouse fury, to inflict vengeance, I have put the blood that she shed on the bare rock, that it should not be covered" (Ezek. 24:8). Israel committed seven sins on that day: they killed a priest and a prophet and a judge, and shed innocent blood, and defiled the court, and it was a sabbath and the day of atonement.¹ When Nebuzaradan came up thither, he saw the blood welling up and asked them, "What kind of blood is this?" They replied, "The blood of bulls and lambs and rams that we used to offer upon the altar." Thereupon he brought bulls and rams and lambs and slaughtered them over it [i. e. Zechariah's blood], but it continued to well up. As they did not confess to him the truth, he strung them up in the place of judgment.² They said, "Inasmuch as the Holy One, Blessed be He! is pleased to require his blood at our hands, [we will tell thee]."³ They said to him, "This is the blood of a priest and prophet and judge, who prophesied against us all that thou art doing to us, and we rose up against him and killed him." Thereupon he brought eighty thousand of the flower of the priesthood and slew them over it, but it continued to well up. Then he reproved it, saying, "Dost thou demand that thy whole people be destroyed on thine account?" Thereupon the Holy One, Blessed be He! was filled with compassion, and said, "If he, flesh and blood, and a cruel man, is filled with compassion for my children, how much more I, of whom it is written, For a merciful God is Yahwè thy God, he will not fail thee, nor destroy thee, nor forget the covenant with thy fathers." Forthwith he signalled to the blood, and it was swallowed up on the spot.

The same version, with slight variations in a somewhat inferior text, is found in the *Pesikta, Ekah* (ed. Buber 122 a-b; quoted also in *Yalkut*, Ezek. § 364), in a midrash on Is. 1:21, 'Righteousness lodged in it, but now murderers.' . . . They killed Uriah the priest;⁴ they killed Zechariah.⁵

¹ Other recensions include "and profaned the Name."

² תלו תליין לגרדון. Cf. *Pesikta*, ed. Buber, 118^b, 122^a, and the editor's notes on these places; Krauss, *Lehnwörter*, II. 183. In exemplification of this sense see especially *Sabb.* 32^a.

³ The close of the sentence is supplied from *Koheleth Rabbah* 3:20.

⁴ See above, page 318, n. 2.

⁵ The story is repeated in *Ekah Rabbathi*, Proem. 23; *ib.* 2, 5; 4, 17; cf. also Proem. 5; *Koheleth Rabbah* 3, 20; 10, 5; *Sanhedrin* 96^b; *Gittin* 57^b. The later versions amplify somewhat, and multiply Nebuzaradan's

The books in which this legend is narrated are, of course, much later than the New Testament; and the rabbis whose names are connected with it (Judan and Aḥa) lived in the 4th cent. A.D. No inference lies, however, from these dates to the age of the legend itself; it is quite possible that the story, which is substantially a midrash on 2 Chron. 24:19-25, showing how the dying prayer of the murdered prophet, "Yahwè see and require it!" (2 Chron. 24:23) was fulfilled, is older than the Christian era.

Comparison with the Gospels shows at least striking coincidences. In Chronicles we are told only that Zechariah was killed "in the court of the Lord's house." "In which court?" R. Judan asks, and R. Aḥa replies, "In the court of the priests"; the Gospels make the same court, "between the temple and the altar," the scene of the sacrilegious murder.¹ The legend of the murder of Zechariah, moreover, furnishes exactly the counterpart to the story of Abel which the Gospel demands: Abel's blood cries unto God from the ground (Gen. 4:10 f., cf. 9:6, etc.); Zechariah's last words are, "Yahwè, see and require it" (2 Chron. 24:22); in the legend, his blood, lying uncovered on the bare rock, arouses God's wrath and incites him to vengeance; it wells up and cannot be stayed. The Jews, confronted with death at Nebuzaradan's hands, recognize that God is resolved to require it

victims—the Great Sanhedrin and the Smaller Sanhedrin, young men and maidens, the students of the schools; conversion of Nebuzaradan. References to the story are found also in *Tanḥuma*. Buber, *Wayyikra* § 8; *Targ. Lament.* 2:20.

Jerome writes: simplices fratres inter ruinas templi et altaris, sive in portarum exitibus, quae Siloam ducunt, rubra saxa monstrantes, Zachariae sanguine putant esse polluta. Non condemnamus errorem, qui de odio Judaeorum, et fidei pietate descendit. This is possibly a last echo of the Jewish legend, rather than merely a reminiscence of the Gospel.

¹ Wellhausen's objection, that Zechariah b. Jehoiada was killed "without, in the court of the temple," begs the question by assuming that the court is here the outer court. The rabbis assumed more naturally that the murder of the priest took place in the inner court. On the other hand, Josephus' ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἱερῶς, does not warrant Wellhausen's inference that Zechariah was killed by the Zealots in the priests' court; it says no more than that the murder was committed within the sacred precincts. As a layman Zechariah would have no business at least in the part of the court between the temple and the altar. The story of the mock trial in Josephus suggests rather the neighborhood of one of the court rooms opening off the outer court.

of them (cf. Luke 11 : 50). Thousands of victims are not sufficient to expiate the seven-fold crime. Note also the correspondence of the situation, the judgment of God on Jerusalem by the hand of the Babylonians and of the Romans. It is noteworthy, too, that the epithet "righteous" is more than once in different versions of the story applied to Zechariah (see *Koheleth Rabbah* 3, 20, זכריה הצדיק, *ib.* 10, 5).

It is not, then, because the death of Zechariah was the last crime of the kind in Jewish history that it is named in the Gospel, but because it was in popular legend the typical example of the sacrilegious murder of a righteous man, a prophet of God, and of the appalling expiation God exacted for it.¹

With regard to the name, it may reasonably be supposed that the original tradition had only "the blood of Zechariah," as in Luke; he appears in the Jewish story regularly without a patronymic, as a well known figure. "Son of Barachias" in Matthew would then be the erroneous gloss of an editor better versed in scripture than in the Midrash; "son of Jehoiada" in the Nazarene Gospel a more correct identification.

3. Matthew 28 : 1.

Ὅψε δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, ἦλθεν Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον.

This verse seems always to have made some difficulty.² The older commentators interpreted it in harmony with the other Gospels (Mark 16 : 1, 2, καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμῃ ἡγόρασαν ἄρώματα ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι

¹ Since this note was written I observe that Nestle, in *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, VI (1905) 198-200, has criticized Wellhausen's comment on this passage in a somewhat similar way. Incidentally I may note that ἐκζητηθῇ (Luke 11 : 51) probably represents neither בַּקֵּשׁ (Baljon) nor יִדְרֵשׁ (Nestle, from Chronicles). but בְּעֵי הוּאִיל וְהִקְבָּה רֹצֵה לְתַבְעֵי דְמוּ מִיְדִינֵי or תַּבְעֵי; cf. *Jer. Taanith* וְגו'.

² Jerome suspects inexact translation: Mihique videtur Evangelista Matthaeus, qui Evangelium Hebraico sermone conscripsit, non tam vespere dixisse quam sero, et eum qui interpretatus est, verbi ambiguitate deceptus, non sero interpretatum esse sed vespere. *Ep.* 120, 4; *ad Hedibiam* (Vallarsi, I. 820). Jerome probably had in mind the expressions בְּמוֹצָאֵי שַׁבָּת, בְּאַפּוֹקֵי שַׁבָּת; see below.

ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν. καὶ λίαν πρὶ τῇ μῇ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου. Luke 24 : 1, Καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἡσυχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν, τῇ δὲ μῇ τῶν σαββάτων ὀρθρου βαθείως ἐπὶ τὸ μνημα ἦλθαν φέρουσαι ἃ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα. Cf. also John 20 : 1, πρὶ σκοτίας ἔτι οὐσης), and contented themselves with adducing passages in Greek writers where ὁψέ seemed to be used in the sense of 'after.' Recent scholars have generally denied this use, and taken σαββάτων as a partitive genitive, 'late on the Sabbath.' Meyer tries to harmonize this with the other gospels by asserting, without any evidence, that Saturday night was in 'civil reckoning' included in the Sabbath. Schmiedel, on the contrary (*Encyclopaedia Biblica*, IV. col. 4041 f., cf. 4072), discovers a discrepancy of about half a day between Matthew and the other Gospels. His words are : "Late on the Sabbath (ὁψέ σαββάτων) means unquestionably, according to the Jewish division of the day, the time about sunset, and the words immediately following—τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, 'as the light shone forth towards the first day of the week,' are elucidated by Luke 23 : 54, where the transition from the Jewish Friday to Saturday (Sabbath)—in other words the time of sunset—is indicated by the expression σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν, 'the Sabbath shone forth.'" Schmiedel then propounds an ingenious hypothesis to explain how the author of Matthew came so egregiously to misunderstand Mark. The supposed discrepancy arises, however, solely from the critic's misunderstanding of Matthew.

The phrases in Matt. 28 : 1 are a literal reproduction, in Greek words, of Jewish idiomatic terms for divisions of time, and to understand them we must go back to the language of the Palestinian tradition of the Gospel. John Lightfoot, in a brief note on the verse, rightly connected ὁψέ σαββάτων with the Hebrew **בְּמוֹצַי שַׁבָּת**, Aramaic **בְּאַפּוֹקֵי שַׁבְּתָא**, the ordinary expressions for the time following the close of the Sabbath at sunset on Saturday; and added that ὁψέ, as the equivalent of these expressions, included the whole of Saturday night. The phrase **בְּמוֹצַי שַׁבָּת** is of very common occurrence; it may suffice here to cite *Berakoth* 29^a, 52^a; *Shabbath* 119^b, 154^b; *Pesahim* 105^a, 105^b; *Rosh ha-Shanah* 23^a; *Jer. Berakoth* 4, 1; *Jer. Taanith* 4, 1; *Bereshith Rabba* 10, 8f.; 11, 1. 2; 12, 6; **בְּמוֹצַי שַׁבְּתוֹת** *Pesahim* 113^a; *Shebuoth* 18^b; cf. **מוֹצַי יוֹם טוֹב**, *Berakoth* 29^a. It always denotes a time after the end of the Sabbath, some-

times immediately after, e. g. in connection with the *habdalah*; sometimes it signifies Saturday night in general; and there are instances in which it refers to the whole of Sunday.¹ Thus in *Jer. Shekalim* 4, 1 we read: "Rabbi Eleazar, son of Rabbi Zadok, said: We belonged to the descendants of Senaah, of Benjamin; when the ninth of Ab happened to fall on a Sabbath we postponed the fast to the following day (למוצאי שבת, i.e. Sunday) and fasted on it, but not the whole day." The same tradition is reported in *Taanith* 12^a as follows: "Rabbi Eleazar, son of Rabbi Zadok, said: I am of the descendants of Senaah [i.e. Senaah], of Benjamin; and once when the ninth of Ab fell on a Sabbath we postponed the fast to the following day (לאחר השבת, cf. *Megillah* 5^b) and fasted on it, but not the whole day; for it was a festival of ours." According to *M. Taanith* 4, 5, the tenth of Ab was the day on which the Benjamite family of Senaah had the right to bring a free-will offering of wood for the temple (see also *Tos. Taanith* 4, 5 ff.)². It is to be observed that למוצאי שבת in *Jer. Shekalim* 4, 1, is equivalent to לאחר השבת in *Tos. Taanith* 4, 6, *Taanith* 12^a. The phrase corresponds to the common מוצאי שביעית, the year after the Sabbatical year, the first year of the year-week (*M. Shebi'ith* 1, 5; 3, 8; 4, 2; 5, 6; 6, 4, etc.; *Jer. Demai*, 2, 1; *Jer. Shebi'ith* 6, 3; *Rosh ha-Shanah* 9^a, etc.); see especially *Jer. Sanhedrin* 1, 2, *Tos. Sanhedrin* 2, 9, *Sanhedrin* 12^a, *Shekalim* 3^a: an intercalary month must not be added either to the Sabbatical year or the year after (מוצאי שביעית). The counterpart of מוצאי שבת

¹ The facts are succinctly and correctly stated in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, s. v. Calendar (III. 502 A); Dalman (*Grammatik*, 197 n.) is mistaken in saying of the expressions באפוקי ש', במפקי שובתא etc. "vom Morgengrauen ab ist die Bezeichnung unmöglich."

² R. Eleazar b. R. Zadok was a grown man when the temple was destroyed in 70 A.D.; see Weiss, *Dor we-Dor*⁴, II. 109; Bacher, *Tanna-iten*², I. 46 ff. This family of Senaah (סנאה, *Ezr.* 2: 35; *Neh.* 3: 3; 7: 38; 3 *Esd.* 5: 23) has been summarily despatched out of the world by Eduard Meyer (*Entstehung des Judentums*, 150, 154, 156) and Cheyne (*Encyclopaedia Biblica*, II. col. 1971 f.), by what are called text-critical operations. Neither of the critics refers to the fact that in the first century after Christ there was a family or clan of this name having certain ancient privileges in the temple not suggested by anything in the Old Testament, and about the origin of which there is an independent tradition (see *Tos. Taanith*, l.c.).

באורתא דתליסר דנגהי; cf. *Pesahim* 4^a דתליסר נגהי ארנסר, in the night of the 13th–14th, etc. The same expression in *Menahoth* 68^b, באורתא דשיתסר נגהי שבסר, the night of the 16th–17th, באורתא דשבסר נגהי תמניסר, 17th–18th. In the beginning of *Pesahim* (2a–3a) there is a discussion about the word נגהי, which literally would seem to mean daylight (נגה, shine); it is finally agreed that it does not indicate a different time from לילי, night; it may be explained as a dialect peculiarity or a euphemistic expression.¹ We may let the explanation go for what it is worth; the fact remains that נגהי, notwithstanding its original meaning, is used of the night, or part of the night. It is not, however, like אורתא, comparison with which immediately suggests itself, a name for ‘night’ in general uses, but occurs only in such phrases as have been quoted above. It may be conjectured that the development of this signification was similar to that of ערב followed by the name of a day; as the latter, from meaning the eve of, say, the Sabbath, came to mean the whole day (Friday) whose evening would usher in the Sabbath, so נגהי came to mean the night whose morning would bring in the following day. The examples of this use of נגהי, it will have been observed, are drawn from the Babylonian Talmud, but a similar idiom is well known in Syriac, e. g., לַלְּכָא לַיְלָא מִן עַמְסָא, Aphr., etc.; see Payne Smith 2281; the Palestinian Lectionary naturally renders τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, לַיְלָא לַסָּף עַמְסָא.²

The Hebrew equivalent of נגהי in this use is אור. Thus in *Jer. Kethuboth* 1, 1 (*Kethuboth* 5^a, *Bereshith Rabbah* 8, 12), a Biblical reason for choosing Wednesday for the wedding of virgins, Thursday for widows, is found in the blessings in Gen. 1:22, 28. The objection that these blessings belong not to Wednesday and Thursday, but to Thursday and Friday respectively, is answered by observing that the consummation of the

¹ See Levy, *Wörterbuch*, III. s. v. The idiom survives in mediæval commentators, e. g. Rashi on *Rosh ha-Shanah* 22^b (end), “לערב יום ל’ נגהי לא” “on the evening of the 30th–31st.”

² Similar extensions are familiar in modern languages. In German, ‘Sonabend,’ for example, has become the name of Saturday, and if we really mean the evening of Saturday (Sunday eve) we say ‘Sonabend Abend’ (cf. Aram. רמשא דערוכתא, etc.). So ‘Morgen’ is ‘tomorrow,’ and for ‘tomorrow morning’ we say ‘Morgen früh.’

marriage occurs in the night following the wedding, **רביעי אור**, **לחמישי**, **חמישי אור** **לשישי**, the night Wednesday–Thursday, and Thursday–Friday, respectively.

On **אור** in this sense see also *M. Pesahim* 1:1, **אור לארבעה עשר**, the night preceding the 14th (13th–14th), *Pesahim* 3^a **אור לשמנים ואחר**, the night between the 80th and the 81st; *Rosh ha-Shanah* 22^b, with Rashi *in loc.*; but in *Sanhedrin* 70^b **אור לעיבור** seems to be the night *following* the 30th; Rashi **מוצאי שלושים**. (Exx. cited by Levy, s. v.)¹

If we suppose that the author of our Greek Matthew had as his source an account of the resurrection in Hebrew which ran: **במוצאי שבת אור לאחר בשבת**, or in Aramaic, **באפוקי שבתא**, **נגהי חר בשבתא**, and rendered it literally, the words $\delta\psi\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \sigma\alpha\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu\ \tau\eta\ \epsilon\pi\iota\phi\omega\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \sigma\alpha\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$, become quite intelligible, and are in agreement with the tradition of the other Gospels that the women went to the tomb by night ($\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \pi\rho\omega\acute{\iota}$, $\delta\rho\theta\rho\omicron\nu\ \beta\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$, $\pi\rho\omega\acute{\iota}$, $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\tau\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta\varsigma$). The only difficulty which then remains is Mark's $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. It is possible that this may have originated in the desire to make clearer, or to put into better Greek, such an expression as the $\tau\eta\ \epsilon\pi\iota\phi\omega\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta$ which we have in Matthew; but this question does not further concern us here.²

Luke 23:54, $\text{Καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευῆς, καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν}$, is another example of the same idiom which we have recognized in Matt. 28:1. Lightfoot, who collected several examples of **אור**, **אורתא**, in the sense of 'night,' renders, *ingruebat nox Sabbati*. Perhaps the sense is rather, "and the next day was the Sabbath," cf. Mark 15:42, $\text{Καὶ ἤδη ὀψίας γενομένης, ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, ὃ ἐστὶν προσάββατον}$. We may conceive that the original of Luke's altogether un-Greek phrase was something like, **ויהוה יומא**;

¹ [I find that A. Geiger, in a review of Sachs' *Beiträge* (ZDMG. XII. 365; see also *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, VIII. 182, IX. 116) explains the use of **אור** and **נגהי** for 'night' in a way similar to that suggested above. He also regards $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\phi\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu$ in Matt. 28:1 as a translation of **אור** or **נגהי**, "hinüberleuchten in den folgenden Tag, die dem Tage vorangehende Nacht."—For other theories see Mayer-Lambert, *RÉJ.* XLIV. 122 f.; W. Bacher, *ib.* 286. The most recent discussion, with full references to the literature, is by Aicher, "**אור** im Sinne von Dunkelheit," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, III (1905), 113–121.]

² The reading $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (D, some Old Latin codd., Aug., al.) may be an attempt to diminish the discrepancy.

דערוכבתא נגהי שבתא (Heb. וְהָיָה הַיּוֹם עֶרְבַּת שַׁבָּת אִוֵּר לְשַׁבָּת); at least ἐπέφωσεν must be accounted for in this way. A reference to the lighting of the Sabbath lamps on Friday evening is altogether fanciful; no one would say in that case “the Sabbath lighted up,” but “they (people) kindled (הדליקו) the lamps.”

Before leaving the subject, I should call attention to the singular expression in Matt. 27: 62, τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον, ἣτις ἐστὶν μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν. Is “Sabbath” intentionally avoided here, by the circumlocution “the day after Friday?”

4. 2 Corinthians 2:14-16. The Savour of Life or of Death.

“Ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ θεῷ ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, οἷς μὲν ὁσμὴ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὁσμὴ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωήν.

Buxtorf, Cappel, Schoettgen, and other older writers pointed out the resemblance of the expressions ὁσμὴ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωήν, to the Hebrew סם חיים, סם מות, deadly poison, life-giving medicine. The parallel is made the more noteworthy by the fact that in Jewish literature this figure is frequently employed to set forth the contrary effects of the Law rightly or wrongly used. Thus in *Sifrè*, Deut. § 45 (on Deut. 11: 18, וְשַׁמַּתֶּם גּוֹ) we read: “נמשלו רברי תורה כסם חיים,” “The words of the Law are compared to an elixir of life”; similarly the Baraitha, *Kiddushin* 30^b; cf. *Erubin* 54^a; R. Judah b. R. Hiyya said: “See how different God is from man! A man gives a drug (סם) to his fellow; it is good for this and bad for that. God is not so; he gave the Law to Israel, a life-giving medicine for its whole body, as the scripture says, ‘And healing to all their flesh’” (Prov. 4: 22), etc. So also in the story of the hawker who went about the towns adjacent to Sepphoris crying, Who wants to buy a life-giving medicine (סם חיים)? and when questioned by R. Jannai told him that he would find the prescription in Ps. 34: 12-14 (*Wayyikra Rabbah* 16, 2). *Sifrè*, Deut. § 306 (on Deut. 32: 2): “R. Banaah was wont to say, If thou doest the commandments of the law for their own sake [disinterested obedience], they are life to thee, as it is written, ‘For they are life to those that find them, healing to all their flesh’ (Prov. 4: 22); but if thou dost not do the commandments of the law for

their own sake they cause thy death, as it is written," etc. (Deut. 32 : 2, **יֵעָרֶף**, interpreted 'break one's neck,' as in Deut. 21 : 4). In *Taanith* 7^a this saying of R. Banaah is reported in a slightly different form: "If a man occupies himself with the study of the law for its own sake, his knowledge of the law is made to him a life-giving medicine (**סם חיים**; Prov. 3 : 8, 18 and 8 : 35); if he does so not for their own sake [but for his own advantage], it is made to him a deadly poison" (**סם מות**; Deut. 32 : 2, etc. as in *Sifrè*). In *Yoma* 72^b R. Joshua b. Levi asks, "What is the meaning of the text, This is the law which Moses set (**שם**) before the Israelites? If a man is good (**זכה**) it is made to him a life-giving medicine (**סם חיים**), if he is not good it is made to him a deadly poison (**סם מות**)." A similar utterance of Rabba is recorded in *Yoma* l. c., If a man is expert in it, etc.; cf. the parallel, *Sabbath* 88b., If he is dexterous, etc. (See Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten*, II. 540.) The saying seems to have had almost proverbial currency at the beginning of the second century A.D.

The word **δσμή** in Paul is not so remote as might at first appear; **סמים** is used in the Old Testament of the odoriferous drugs—gums and spices—of which the compound incense was made. In the Septuagint the phrase **קטרת סמים** ('incense of drugs') is usually rendered by *θυμίαμα σύνθετον*, etc., but we find also *ἀρώματα, ἡδύσματα*; the latter is generally preferred by the later Greek translators. *Bereshith Rabbah* 10, 6 (ed. Theodor, p. 78 f.) quotes from Bar Sira, **אלוה העלה סמים מן הארץ בהם הרופא מרפא המכה ורוקח עושה המרקחת**. In Greek (Ecclus. 38 : 4, 7, 8: *Κύριος ἔκτισεν ἐκ γῆς φάρμακα . . ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐθεράπευσεν καὶ ἦρεν τὸν πόνον αὐτοῦ, μυρεψὸς δὲ ἐν τούτοις ποιήσει μίγμα*). Thus **סמים** are 'drugs,' *φάρμακα*, used, as the case may be, by the physician or the perfumer. Modern etymologists may derive **סמים**, 'odorifera' (Assyr. *sammāti*, see Gesenius-Buhl), from a different root; but ultimate etymologies were not in the consciousness of those who used the language. Many of the drugs, medicinal and poisonous, employed in ancient practice had a strong smell; fragrant gums and the like were used as remedies. It is quite possible, therefore, as Cappel seems to have been the first to point out, that the singular expression, 'an odor of life,' or of death, is a more or less indistinct reminiscence of Hebrew phrases such as have been cited above, and of the application of them to describe the effect of the law rightly received and obeyed, or the opposite.

5. Jubilees 34:4, 7. Zarethān-Šarṭābeh.

In the story of the war of Jacob and his sons with the Amorites, Jub. 34:1-9, one of the cities whose kings were confederated against the patriarchs is Sarēgān (variously written in Charles' manuscripts, Sērāgān, Sarāgān, Sārēkān, Sērēgān, Sērāgen; Lat. Saragan). Charles (*Book of Jubilees*, p. 202) tabulates the varying forms of the names of the kings in different sources;¹ on Sērāgān (v. 4) he writes: "In the Hebrew authorities the word appears as Sartan. I can discover nothing further about it." A comparison of the sources will solve the problem, and at the same time perhaps throw some light on a disputed point of Old Testament topography. The corresponding passage in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Judah, 5) has ἀπήλθομεν εἰς Αρεταν,² Lat. *Aretan*; in the Midrash the name appears as סרטן. It is obvious that in the Testaments we should emend εἰς<Σ>αρεταν, and that the Ethiopic Sarēgān arises from the blunder of a Greek scribe, ΣΑΡΕΤΑΝ for ΣΑΡΕΤΑΝ. The place is the Old Testament Šarethan (צרתן; Σαρθαν codd. in 1 Kings 4:12; 7:46; Euseb., *Onomasticon*, ed. Lagarde 296₉₂ Σαρθαν, ὑπὸ κάτω Ἰεζραελ; Jerome, *ib.* 153₂₄ Sarthan, quae est ad radices Iezrahelis. This comes direct from 1 Kings 4:12, not from Eusebius' knowledge of the site).

Van de Velde proposed to identify the site of Šarethan with the modern Ḳarn Šarṭābeh. The position agrees well enough with the few indications in the Old Testament, according to which the place was included by Solomon in the same administrative district with Beth-shean, Jezreel, and Abel-meholah (1 Kings 4:12), and was on the west side of the Jordan valley, opposite Succoth (1 Kings 7:46), not far from Adam (Josh. 3:16), i. e. probably the modern crossing at Damieh.³ It is rightly thought to be meant by Šeredah, 2 Chron. 4:17; 1 Kings 11:26; and Šererah, Jud. 7:22. Ḳarn Šarṭābeh, on a

¹ Cf. the table made up by Bousset, *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, I (1900), 202 ff.

² Variants Αβητα, P; ἐτέραν O. The former an error in uncial script; the latter a false correction of the unknown name. In the Armenian version, Conybeare (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, VIII. 471 ff.) notes no variant. Issaverdens gives *Arista*, with one manuscript; four others collated in the Venice edition have *Arita*.

³ See *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XIII (1894), 77 ff.; cf. Stade-Schwally, *Kings* (Polychrome Bible), on 4:12 and 7:46.

promontory of mountain thrust out into the Jordan valley opposite el-Damieh, is therefore at least in the neighborhood in which Şarethan is to be looked for. Van de Velde's suggestion has not met much favor, chiefly on account of the dissimilarity of the names.¹

In the various narratives of the war of the patriarchs with the Amorite kings, Saretan is named in conjunction with Tappuah, Hazor,² Shiloh, and Gaash, all places in the same region in which we gather from the Old Testament that Şarethan lay, and within a comparatively short distance from Kārṇ Şartābeh. Now, it is noteworthy that in the Testament of Judah, 5, and in all the Hebrew stories, the strength of Sartan and its citadel and the inaccessibility of its site are dwelt upon as though in this respect it was singular among the cities which the patriarchs stormed. In reading them we can readily imagine that the authors had Kārṇ Şartābeh in mind. Compare, for example, the description in the *Memoirs of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, II. 396: "The top of the mountain is a cone artificially shaped, like that of Jebel Fureidīs, and some 270 feet high. On all sides but the west this is practically unapproachable: on the west a trench has been cut, and the saddle thus made lower. The slope of the sides is about 35°. The top measures 90 feet from east to west and 258 feet north and south, being an oval." On this summit are the ruins of a citadel or castle; the town lay lower down, though still in a very strong position. The summit is 379 m. above the sea, and rises 679 m. above the Jordan valley.³ In the Mishna, *Rosh ha-Shanah* 2, 4 (*Tosephta*, *Rosh ha-Shanah* 2, 2), where Sartābeh is named as one of the peaks on which the signal fires for the new moon were repeated, the name is written סרטבא. The modern Arabic name is صرطبة ;

¹ See e. g. Dillmann on Josh. 3 : 16 ; Moore on Judges 7 : 22 (p. 213) : Kittel, *Könige*, p. 34 ; Buhl, *Geographie*, 181 ; Selbie, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v. Zarethān. Clermont-Ganneau is especially vehement in his rejection of the theory ; see *Memoirs of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, II. 398 ff.

² Hazor is not the city of that name in Galilee, but Baal Hazor, modern Tell 'Aşur.

³ See Guérin, *Samarie*, I. 243 ff. ; *PEF. Memoirs*, II. 380 f., 396 f.—Dillmann's objection, that a city can hardly have stood on the peak, is irrelevant.

cf. **צלח סלכר**, and see Kampfmeyer, ZDPV. XV. 69, XVI. 53. If the Talmudic and modern names are connected with the Old Testament **צרתן** (query **צדרתן***) we should have an interesting example of a shift of emphatics, **צת** of the older name becoming **ט-ס** in later Hebrew or Aramaic, and then, by an equalization in Arabic, **ص-ط**. However that may be, **צרתן**, **סרטן**, and **سرطنة**, **سرطناء**, prove that the phonetic irregularity does not prohibit the identification of Šarethan with Kārṇ Šarṭabeh, if the topographical evidence is sufficient.

6. Jubilees 7:4.

In the description of Noah's sacrifice in this verse. Charles translates: "And he prepared the kid first, and placed some of its blood on the flesh that was on the altar," etc. Littmann, more exactly, "das Fleisch des Altars." It is curious that none of the editors or translators of the book seems to have hesitated at this nonsense. The goat is a sin-offering, preparatory to the holocaust; the blood belongs on the *horns* of the altar, not on the "flesh of the altar." The Ethiopic *šēgā* represents a transcriptional error in Greek, *κρέατα* for *κέρατα*, or a misreading by the translator to the same effect.

It may be observed also that **ማሕሸፉ**, **ማሕሸፀ**, in the Ethiopic version of the Old Testament renders *ερίφος* not only when the Greek word stands for **נָדִי** but where the Hebrew has **שְׁעִיר** (e. g. Gen. 37:31). Charles' translation "kid" is here misleading; no departure from the usual ritual of the sin offering is implied, in which the victim was a full-grown goat.